

RECEIVED

BEFORE THE

2011 DEC -7

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20268Appellant Reply Brief  
In Response to USPS  
Answering  
Brief

In the Matter of:

POSTAL REGULATORY  
COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARYPOSTAL REGULATORY  
COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARYLorraineNY  
State13659  
ZIP CodeDocket No: A 2011-101

Post Office

Susan PaineBilkey Moore, Petitioner(s)

## PARTICIPANT STATEMENT

1. Petitioner(s) are appealing the Postal Service's Final Determination concerning the Lorraine post office. The Final Determination was posted 8/23/2011.  
NY (date)

2. In accordance with applicable law, 39 U.S.C. § 404(d)(5), the Petitioner(s) request the Postal Regulatory Commission to review the Postal Service's determination on the basis of the record before the Postal Service in the making of the determination.

3. Petitioners: Please set out below the reasons why you believe the Postal Service's Final Determination should be reversed and returned to the Postal Service for further consideration. (See pages of the Instructions for an outline of the kinds of reasons the law requires us to consider.) Please be as specific as possible. Please continue on additional paper if you need more space and attach the additional page(s) to this form.

— Please See Attached pages —

IN THE MATTER OF :

LORRAINE POST OFFICE  
LORRAINE, NY 13659

APPELLANT REPLY BRIEFS  
IN RESPONSE TO USPS ANSWERING BRIEF

On page 19 in the closing paragraph the USPS states that “after taking all factors into consideration, the PS determined that the advantages of discontinuance outweigh the disadvantages.” It is interesting that the PS uses the term “advantages” in the plural. The only advantage is to the USPS and that is the single advantage of saving money for the USPS. There are no advantages to the Lorraine postal customer in closing the local post office regardless of any other things listed no matter how they may be contrived by the USPS. Lorraine customers acknowledge that they need to contribute to resolving the financial crisis facing the USPS along with the rest of the US population and they have proposed a drastic curtailment and modification of service delivery short of elimination in order to save money. However, on page 17 the following statement sends a loud and clear message “...the PS is not required to evaluate and reject alternative proposals.” It becomes very clear to all customers concerned that there is no interest in accommodating other thoughts or ideas to save money regarding service delivery to rural and less populated areas. The message clearly indicates that management will do what it chooses and at the discretion of management certain customers will see local window service eliminated rather than severely curtailed as requested and suggested by the local customer base. This in order to maintain a constant level of service without any sacrifice to other customer areas. Even using PS numbers and proposing a means that could create a self-sustaining “office” the powers to be disregarded any deviation because they were not “required to consider” it and it did not fit their plan of “slash and burn”. It is no wonder that the population has developed such a disrespect and negative attitude toward their government and its agencies.

The USPS takes issue with the petitioners concerns that rural areas are being more severely impacted than urban areas. The USPS justification is that assessments are done on a case-by-case basis of small offices and urban stations alike. It is unlikely that any urban closure will place customers in a position where a 22 mile round trip is necessary to access a postal facility which will be the case for many Lorraine customers. This justification does not change the fact that that it is rural post offices that are being eliminated by the thousands and consideration of service reduction and alterations are being dismissed as “not required”.

On page 15 again the PS states that they are “not required” to take into account costs of travel to other post offices, difficulty of winter maintenance for mailboxes and the “green” impact for travel, etc. Again the desires of the USPS supersede the customer.

The USPS indicates that any effects on business is purely speculative. What is not speculative, but is rather a FACT, is that an individual planning to retire in July 2011 and open a business upon retirement cancelled his plans immediately upon receiving notice that the post office would be closing. There are no plans to consider another location as it ironically was to be a mail order business and the post office location was a critical factor.

In responding to the Participant Statements the PS did not address the expressed concern that the information in the procedure was misleading and mismanaged. It was one thing to “un-ring” the bell at the public meeting, but when the FD was published and the same reasons were given that had been denied at the public meeting the bell was rung again. This strongly suggests that there was an attempt to manipulate the discussion at the public meeting.

Also for the second time the PS fails to acknowledge that 1 ½ to 2 hours per day is spent sorting the mail for the 225 customers served from the Lorraine office. This time will continue to be spent at another location. A clerk on site providing this service for this length of time would serve the request by petitioners for part-time service with no additional employee cost, only rent cost. However as previously stated, the USPS is not “required” to consider this service modification. The Petitioners in Lorraine believe that the word “Service” should be dropped from the name US Postal Service.

#### SUMMARY:

1. Advantages as listed in the FD are only advantages as seen or imagined by the USPS. They are not considered as advantages that replace window access by the customer base. They are determined as such only by the USPS.
2. Disadvantages are minimized and glossed over with respect to views of Lorraine customers.
3. The USPS in their comments on appeal fail to address misleading information presented at the public meeting.
4. The USPS does not acknowledge mail sorting time as part of the workload for the local customer base. This time will not change with the closure of this office. It will only be relocated.
5. The removal of the Lorraine post office is a reduction of the community infrastructure and just the discussion has had an impact on the community.

6. The rationale for maximum degree of effective and regular service is set so low that the same justification used in Lorraine could be used to close nearly every post office in rural America if the PS so desired.

7. Unfortunately and sadly by their own statements the USPS indicates that because regulations do not require them to look at other proposals or alternatives when considering closures, they choose not to. There is no indication that they are prohibited from considering other service formats which might service rural areas in a different matter and still recognize substantial savings w/o completely eliminating service windows.

8. To all who have participated in this process it is clear that the entire procedure is designed and protected by regulation so as to give the USPS carte blanc authority while placing the customer base at the complete mercy of their desires and decisions.

CONCLUSION:

THE APPELLANTS RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THIS FINAL DETERMINATION BE RETURNED FOR FURTHER REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION DUE TO THE FACT THAT CONCERNS ADDRESSED IN THE ORIGINAL APPEAL PARTICIPANT STATEMENT WERE NOT ADDRESSED IN THE USPS COMMENTS REGARDING APPEAL.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Paine, Appellant  
5519 Co. Rt. 92  
Lorraine, NY 13659

Bilkey Moore, Participant  
20692 Co. Rt. 93  
Box 66  
Lorraine, NY 13659